


Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 also stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,7187,759 in view of Miki *et al.*

As noted in the Office Action, an obviousness-type double patenting rejection can be overcome by filing a terminal disclaimer under 37 C.F.R. §1.321. Enclosed herewith is such a terminal disclaimer signed by the undersigned attorney of record. Therefore, this terminal disclaimer renders the obviousness-type double patenting rejections moot.

Applicant hereby requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,  
Keith A. Tabor

Dated: April 13, 2005

By:   
George E. Haas  
Registration No. 27,642

Quarles & Brady LLP  
411 E. Wisconsin Avenue Suite 2040  
Milwaukee, WI 53202-4497  
Telephone (414) 277-5751

Q&BMKE\5725335.1